

TOWNSHIP OF HADDON
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
NOVEMBER 3, 2022

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board, held on Thursday November 3, 2022 in the Municipal Building, 135 Haddon Avenue, Haddon Township, New Jersey 08108.

FLAG SALUTE
CONFIRMATION OF SUNSHINE LAW

Chapter 231, Public Law requires adequate notice of this meeting be provided by specifying time, place and agenda. This has been done by mailing a copy of the agenda to the Courier-Post and the retrospect newspaper and by posting on two bulletin boards in the municipal building.

ROLL CALL

Richards Rotz	Present
John Foley	Present
Suzanne Discher	Present
Joe Buono	Excused
Marguerite Downham	Present
Greg Wells	Present
Eve Keller	Excused
Commissioner Ryan Linhart	Excused
James Stevenson	Excused
Renee Bergmann	Absent
Jose Calves	Present
Chris Janoldi	Absent
Meredith Kerschner	Absent

ALSO, PRESENT

Lou Garty – Solicitor

Lee Palo – Zoning Officer

Gregory Fusco – Board’s Engineer and Professional Planning Consultant

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rotz at 7:30 p.m.

A motion by John Foley to approved the minutes from 10-6-22, seconded by Marguerite Downham. 4 members voted in the affirmative (Rotz, Foley, Discher, Downham) 2 abstention (Bergmann, Calves) Motion passed minutes from 10/26/2022 were approved

Application 22-14 – Block 20.01 Lot 1 – Zone R2 – 26 Lindis Farne Avenue – Andrea Guadagno - Applicant is seeking to build a one-story addition seeking relief from front yard setback and side yard setback and additional bulk variance

Page 2

Mr. Edward Jesiolowski – Licensed architect in PA and NJ – 40 + years in the business approximately 100 times appearing at planning and zoning boards was sworn in, He is the Architect for the applicant.

Mr. Rotz – stated that the survey is dated 10/06/2021 –

Ms. Garty stated at the time they applied in March the survey was good

Mr. Rotz – we go by the date that you file application so survey is good marked as A1.

Mr. Jesiolowski confirmed no changes to survey since done. Diagram shows existing conditions, survey, photos of property, A is the side of the property, in the rear of the property is the high-speed line, pictures C is the side of the property, the stone area goes from the back of the property to the speed line. There is a front yard setback, want to put an addition on the back of the house.

Mr. Rotz – It abuts to the high-speed line

Mr. Jesiolowski – it is considered a corner property that needs two setbacks. Front yard setback is 25 ft requirement, existing is 16 ft. we are not touching the front of the house.

Mr. Rotz – how many sq ft are you adding?

Mr. Jesiolowski – requirements for HT on R2 single family residential area. The existing house is the yellow, the new addition is front the side back, speed line in the back, gravel area is French street. Because that is there it is considered a corner property.

Mr. Rotz – it is not considered a corner property; it is a corner property.

Mr. Jesiolowski – it is technically considered street but in reality, it isn't a street but because it is we needs a 25 ft setback, we are proposing a 5 ft setback. There is no parking, no asphalt, is it really a street? And if it is not a street the setback would be required to be 6 ft. If it is a street the setback requirement is 25 ft at that point. We are asking for relief to build that side of the house at 5 ft.

Mr. Foley – I think the chairman asked about sq ft/

Mr. Jesiolowski –

Mrs. Guadagno – sworn in, and stated that the added sq. footage Garage 77 sq ft, 500 sq ft for kitchen.

Mr. Palo –

Mr. Jesiolowski – the new building construction is the following. B is 422 sq ft, 158 sq ft 24 sq ft, garage is 777 sq ft. Total of

Mr. Rotz – adding approximately 1500 sq ft in new building

Mr. Jesiolowski – we are allowed to have the coverage of 30% allowed 2250 sq ft. We have 2455 sq ft. which comes out to 32.7% we are allowed 30% 2.27 over allowance. Lot is

Mr. Foley – why is the garage so big?

Page 3

Ms. Guadagno – The garage is for antique car and motorcycle and working on them in the garage, he needs a lot of space.

Ms. Garty – will you agree that there will be no plumbing and no electrical.

Mrs. Guadagno – No there will only be light and heat, no water service. It will not be used for living space.

Mr. Rotz – how many bays in the garage? And they are going to all access the non-street street.

Mrs. Downham – The street there is used for Patco to get to the drains.

Mr. Calves – The point of the non-street, street the purpose of what the architect is trying to stress is that none of the reasons we would be worried about the bulk variance being so close to the street, we don't need to be worried about it because it is not a heavy traffic street.

Mrs. Downham – Is the height of the garage going to be 37 ft.? I see it written in the illustration in green.

Mr. Jesiolowski – that's not the height this is the floor plan, maybe 15 ft. height of garage

Mr. Rotz- on the other side of French, what is over there?

Mrs. Guadagno – what would be across from her garage is her backyard, just trees.

Mr. Jesiolowski – photograph D is neighbor's house, with my back to the high-speed line, to the left is the neighbor.

Mr. Rotz – so their backyard is an open backyard. Specifically what variances are you requesting?

Mr. Jesiolowski – setback variance and building coverage and we comply with impervious coverage.

Mr. Rotz – so you are 205 ft over coverage

Mr. Jesiolowski – yes, 205.8 ft over

Mr. Rotz – why are you asking for it, could you not make it smaller?

Mrs. Guadagno – we are trying to make a little living area in the house. The addition includes a laundry room, family room that goes out to the deck, garage and a small laundry room are all part of the addition.

Mr. Rotz – why couldn't you make the project smaller and comply with the lot coverage?

Mr. Jesiolowski – these rooms are basically to the minimum; they are not overabundant in square footage. The standard garage is 20 ft deep and 10-12 ft side for a single car.

Mr. Rotz – so basically you want the sq footage for the garage?

Mrs. Guadagno – yes.

Page 4

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public on this application only seconded by Marguerite Downham. All member present voted in the affirmative. Moton carried.

Mrs. Lori Leonard – 19 Lindis Farne Ave. – Sworn In

Mrs. Leonard – questions about application because unclear in notice, so it is an addition on the back of the house and a three-car garage?

Mrs. Guadagno – in my opinion a three-car garage does not fit into this neighborhood. Most people on the street don't have garages. There is already limited parking on the street, we take on the parking from the events on the square and those are parking spots that if they are taken away, they will be jamming into our spots.

Mr. Foley – what she is proposing is garages off of the street, my observation, my understanding of the application, the cars will still be in the garage, you will still have the same spaces on the street that you have.

Mrs. Leonard – how will they enter?

Mr. Calves – do the cars park there during the events?

Mrs. Leonard – yes, they do. They park on the gravel. My concern is that the cut out for the driveway will take spaces away from them. No one pays attention and they always park there. The other thing that I am really concerned about is the amount of water the flows into that cross street, sometimes its backups along that road and in front of houses. What happens from the water runoff that is now going to be part of this structure?

Mrs. Guadagno – in my backyard where it always goes.

Mr. Calves – they are actually still under the impervious coverage, as long as they comply with the code it is okay.

Mrs. Leonard – they are building something off of that not street, and that water will go down across the sidewalk into the street.

Mr. Jesiolowski – the runoff will not go into the street it will go onto their property.

Mr. Fusco – Board's Engineer was sworn In - what the applications architect just testified to the drains will be directed toward the rear of the property which will drain off into the back ditch and not out towards the street. We will have to hold to that when they issue the final CO.

Mr. Calves – can we make it a condition.

Mrs. Guadagno – yes it will go into the ditch where the Speedline is.

Mr. Fusco – they still need a yard setback and variance. When they use the three-car garage when the street gets warn and the gravel gets warn they won't come to the township o get it paved because it will be a street.

Page 5

Mr. Foley – will you talk about the cars; how frequently will they be coming in and out of the garage. The observation I am trying to find out is if these are cars that are in and out every day. Classic cars I don't believe that is the same thing typically undercover, take them out on nice days, part of her concern is that you will have more cars there taking spaces. How often will they not be in the garage.

Chris Brees – Boyfriend of the applicant was sworn in

Mr. Brees – The cars don't come out often. They run on premium; they are not necessary. They will be parked in the garage.

Mr. Rotz - you have 5 vehicles, where do they normally park?

Mrs. Guagano – on the street where we normally do.

Mrs. Leonard – they don't look like you think they would and the one is loud. Final concern is that I hope it is not a business, I hope that they won't be working on the car where there is oil draining down.

Mr. Foley – we will make a condition of the application and there are recourses there and ways that we can address that.

Mrs. Downham – one more question about the driveway. There is no driveway in front of your house right now?

Mrs. Guadagno – there is a curb cut there

Mr. Fusco – if you do put a garage on French, you have 20 ft to store the car. They won't be able to park in front of the garage like normal because they would be in violation of the right of way.

Mr. Wells – you don't have enough driveway in front of your garage to park a car.

Mrs. Guadagno – wanted to put it out to the gravel but I didn't think that it would be allowed so we did a ft setback.

Mr. Calves – you can't park in the transition with the right of way

Mrs. Leonard – there are always cars park there. Will this make it better or make it worse.

Mrs. Discher – the woman is concerned that you are not running an auto repair business

Mr. Brees – correct, just a hobby.

Mr. Well – Mr. Fusco question about the street. You own the house now but when someone else lives there they will have a 3-car garage. What would happen to the gravel street is it the responsibly of the own to get it paved?

Mr. Fusco – that is why I raised the question.

Mr. Calves – what they are saying now is that people park up and down that street now and if you had a driveway people would not park in front of the driveway.

Morris Cooperman - Sworn

Page 6

44 Lindis Farne Ave

Mr. Cooperman – talking about being within 5ft of French? How do we know where that is since its gravel?

Mr. Rotz – survey

Mr. Cooperman – how do you know where that is? From the property line and the street. I know that there's is a tax map that shows where that street is. That is the towns paid for property. Talking about going over towards French 5 ft into French. How close onto north Atlantic.

Mr. Calves – 26 ft to the property line

Mr. Cooperman – 26 ft to the fence. If there are considerations around trees, it should be involved on any decisions as far as removing trees and altering trees in any shape or form. Remember we are moving any capacity to put street side trees there. I think we need to think about canopy cover and Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Rotz – if they have jurisdiction over a tree, they have that. Do you support or oppose the application?

As the process moves forward, any considerations with respect to the people's trees need to have consideration to the shade tree. If you put a driveway in you are moving potential space for a street side shade tree.

Mr. Rotz – if they build this garage there will be no shade tree in that area.

Mr. Foley – is there any portion that is public property, I thought it was your own property. Understand that there is a strip of grass outside of my home that the town owns that a tree has gone in.

Mr. Jesiolowski – the space on the side that is township property, there is a large area up for planting trees. Our little 5 ft piece is no off of their property. Access garage from gravel.

Mr. Calves – how far from garage door to garage?

Mr. Fusco – almost 18 ft if it were to be developed under a standard ft it would be able 18 ft.

Mr. Cooperman – when you look at it in those numbers it is a healthy difference.

A motion by John Foley to close the public portion, seconded by Greg Wells. All members present voted in the Affirmative. Public Portion closed at 8:15 pm

Mr. Fusco – if the right of way were approved for whatever reason, the applicant and the architect need to pay attention to how high the finished floor of the garage will be.

Mrs. Guadagno – you can't see it unless you go down there. It might make it look nicer if anything.

Mr. Wells – what about having 5 cars on the lot.

Mrs. Guadagno – I have one driveway, my mom has her car, Chris has his car and work truck, and then my car.

Page 7

Mr. Wells – talking about parking variances, they have no driveway.

Mrs. Guadagno – with the three car garage the three cars will be in the three spots off of the street into a garage out of the view.

Mr. Rotz – photo array is A2, elevations are A3

Mrs. Garty – applicant is seeking to construct a 1 story addition, relief from front yard setback 16.44 ft existing 25 ft required, front yard setback permitted to have 17.87 ft where 25 requires, proposed 1 front yard addition has 25 ft where a setback of 5 ft is proposed, buildings coverage amount is 30/5 proposed 32.7% of the property would be covered. It will not be used as a living area, it will have some electric and heat, the spouts directed towards the backward and not the street. Condition that no business permitted on the property related the repair of the vehicles to be conducted on the side. No oil, gas fluids to train into the public drainage system. No vehicles in the front of the garage, because that is the right of way, not removing the tree on the street. Proposed garage complies with height and other specifications. The addition will enable her to better use her property.

Mrs. Downham – as Mr. Cooperman said, I am the liaison to the Environmental commission. I am starting to have a problem with three car garages. And a lot of them that have been approved have become a real problem. This is on a side street in a smaller neighborhood. It is still a violation of the front yard setback. I don't think it is a good idea in this neighborhood.

Mr. Calves – I think the real issue here is that impervious lot coverage, as long as it is met that I was largely unaided the issue with the three-car garage. I don't see how it doesn't do anything other than helping the parking issues. Lindis Farne is a rough spot for parking, so taking these spots would be good. The garage is facing an unfinished street. Most of the negative aspects of the front yard setbacks are not an issue here. It will prevent people from parking there that park there now. I would agree that 98% of cases that a three-car garage is too big and doesn't make sense. But because of the nature of the street and purpose of it I think those concerns are addressed. You could make the garage a little bit smaller, maybe a condition that would meet the building coverage and make that smaller it would put those cars back on the street. It seems the best fix that you have for cutting down on the parking issues. Right now, they are trying to fit 5 cars on that little driveway to the house and this seems like a step in the right direction.

Mr. Rotz – I agree with Mr. Calves – I think that this is too big. If you remember the garage-mahal that ft was attempting to be approved in the heights. This isn't even close to that, the elevations, approximately, maybe bring this into compliance by talking

A motion by Jose Calves to approve the application as presented with conditions stated by the solicitor, seconded by John Foley. 5 Yes votes – 1 -No vote (Mrs. Downham) Motion carried. Application approved.

Application 22-32 – Block 19.10 Lot 6 – Zone R1 – 301 Evergreen Ave – Lianna Petroski – Applicant is seeking to install a 4' fence in front yard.

Mr. Rotz -remarked that the applicant is looking to place a 4 ft fence where a 3 ft is permitted.

Page 8

Ms. Petroski – the fence is existing; this is a request to keep it there

Mrs. Downham – so it is on township property?

Ms. Petroski – the fence will be moved off of township property, but I need to get the variance for the height.

Mr. Rotz – we have to view it as the fence is not there.

Ms. Petroski – proposing to bring the fence back to the lot line with a 4 ft height

Mrs. Downham – where is the gate?

Ms. Petroski – dimension of 17 ft distance from driveway and garage to lot line, it is there where the fence curves in to touch the garage.

Mr. Foley – why 4 ft vs. 3 ft?

Ms. Petroski – fence constructed to contain my dog who is very active and would jump the three ft fence, two young children in age and the fence helps to give them a little protection when they are in the back. I am on a corner lot, but my garage is in the back of the house so I can't see the backyard and it is nice to know that they are contained in a fenced in yard.

Mr. Foley – I do like the fence; it is an attractive fence.

Ms. Petroski – I was resistant to build a fence, we tried to find a decorative fence, goes with aesthetic with house and neighborhood. I have received lots of compliments on fence and no complaints.

Mr. Rotz – so you are on a corner property and Norwood Terrace is running alongside, fence has moved beyond property line out towards the street.

Ms. Petroski – the reason it is out that far is because it is all grass

Mr. Rotz - how far is the lot line from the street?

Ms. Petroski – the fence is extending 9 ft beyond property line the way I am reading a survey. Curb is another 4-5 ft.

Mr. Fusco – between 3-4 ft.

Mr. Rotz – photo is A2, resident will submit to Bonnie.

Mrs. Downham – do you know where property line is so that when it is done it is moved to the correct spot.

Mr. Palo – yes there is a marker on the fence.

Mr. Rotz – so issue is height and location of fence.

Mrs. Downham – I don't have a problem with that fence being there at 4 ft. there are not sigh issues and it is attractive.

Page 9

Mr. Rotz – only issue is where, I don't know from this application where she is asking to put it

Mr. Calves – I think she is looking to figure out where she can put it.

Mr. Rotz – I would say 6 inches beyond property line would be reasonable.

Ms. Petroski – okay, that is fine.

Mrs. Discher – when the builder comes to put in the fence, they don't know these requirements, how can they just go in a put in a fence?

Mrs. Richards – she didn't use a fence company, her landscaper put it in.

Mr. Rotz – sometimes they say where do you want the fence and they put it in.

Mrs. Richards – when you first put it in did you ask for a permit to do it?

Ms. Petroski – no we did not.

Mr. Wells –there is an 8 ft latus fence beyond the house.

Ms. Petroski – it is a trellis that ivy grows on and if you want me to take it down, I would be happy to take it down. That paved area is a patio and that gives us some privacy. It is not a fence.

A motion by John Foley to close public portion, seconded Marguerite Downham. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Rotz – aluminum, black ionized rod iron fence in what is technically the front yard because it is a corner property. It will bring her 10 ft

A motion by John Foley to approve this application as presented, seconded by Marguerite Downham. 6 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes Motion carried.

Application 22-38 – Block 14.08 Lot 6 – 910 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Zone R-1 - Mr. and Mrs. Westerfield – Applicants are seeking to construct a 2-story addition.

Mr. Westerfield - Sworn In

Mr. Rotz remarked - They is the existing survey and the proposed, the proposed shows in the spirit of what is there now and not to make the existing additions worse. To the rear of the property, it is about 9 ft we did the addition with two gables to keep the setback at 9 or more. The variances were approved in 2008-2009 with the previous owners.

Mr. Rotz –stated that the survey is dated July 2022 and will be marked A1 the survey showing the proposed will be marked A2 shows current condition on the site. And you have, by definition an irregular shaped lot. Each of your setbacks are preexisting non-conforming, area 10,000 sq ft required 6000.

Mr. Westerfield – not going over coverage or impervious

Page 10

Mr. Rotz – is addition going up or out?

Mr. Westerfield – out 10 ft from existing and 2 story. Addition will condition 2718 back. You can see it juts out to 9.11 and the other to 9.22

Mr. Rotz – lot dept required 100, not possible on lot it is 89.95 but gets smaller and smaller, preexisting non-conforming situation. I don't see how you could possibly measure 100 ft.

Mr. Rotz – You have elevations and will be marked A3

Mrs. Downham – do you have a garage?

Mr. Westerfield – I do not.

Mr. Foley – They had a garage that was converted to living space at some point

Mr. Westerfield – yes.

Mr. Rotz – You also have grading plan and will be marked A4, and your photo array will be marked A5.

Mr. Park one car in the driveway and a permit for the other car on the street

Mr. Westerfield – I don't have a master bath and that is what this is about. The first floor that is there comes off and this makes it nicer and it will all conform.

Mr. Fusco – The board's engineer asked is it your intention to leave the fence?

Mr. Westerfield – yes,

Mr. Fusco – it is 3 ft high right?

Mr. Westerfield – yes

Mr. Fusco – there doesn't

Mrs. Downham – you have a 6 ft fence, and it is solid wood.

Mr. Palo – ordinance is 5 ft for a fence, if you decide to change that you will need to ask for that.

Mr. Westerfield – with the traffic you see right through the house, it is a small lot and without the fence you have no privacy.

A motion by John Foley to open to public, Seconded by Greg Wells. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by Joh Foley to close public portion, seconded Greg Wells. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

A motion by Greg Wells to approve the application as presented, seconded John Foley. 6 members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Application22-40- Block 16.01 Lot 24 – Zone R1 – 408 Graisbury Ave. – Jennifer Moriarty – Applicant is seeking to install a 6' fence in the rear yard.

Page 11

Ms. Moriarty – Sworn In

Mrs. Downham – is the fence existing?

Ms. Moriarty – yes, we put it up in June 2021. We purchased the house, asked a company to put up a fence, asked for the highest fence allowable. Apparently, they did not check the ordinance and we wrongfully believed them and they did not get permits.

Mr. Rotz – why shouldn't it be 5 ft?

Ms. Moriarty – we have two small kids, two small dogs, intent is to get a pool when children are a bit bigger. We would prefer not to slice the fence down a foot, and we do not really have the funds to replace it after doing the renovations on our house. It is a wooden panel fence.

Mr. Foley – what is on the other side of the fence in the backyard?

Ms. Moriarty – the rear was a preexisting fence, before we purchased and that is 5 ft, behind you butts up against neighbor's yard, the two sides abut our neighbors' yards.

Mrs. Downham – the part behind house is 5 ft and the sides are 6 ft?

Ms. Moriarty – yes. And you asked about the type of fence and references towards a preference. We were living in our house with two kids and dogs and we just wanted to get a fence up, this was the guy that had wood during covid and we had to go with it. SO, we hired him and he had that wood.

Mrs. Garty – if the application is approved would they need to get a permit for the fence?

Ms. Moriarty – yes, I did apply for one.

Mr. Foley – it is almost like after the fact, you mentioned the hardship that you had at the time getting the fence. When you contact the fence builder, was it once of those things. I only have 6 ft fence and that is all I have.

Mr. Calves – well she said, however high I am allowed to have.

Ms. Moriarty – when it was 6, I didn't think anything of it because most towns it is 6 ft.

Mr. Wells – your fence guy put it a bit on your neighbor's property and we are not authorizing that.

Ms. Moriarty – there were stakes there when we moved in and if the neighbors do have a property, we will fix the issues but the neighbors are okay with it.

A motion by John Foley to open public portion, seconded by marguerite Downham. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by John Foley to close public portion, Seconded Marguerite Downham. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

A motion by Jose Calves to approve this application as presented, seconded John Foley.

Page 12

Mr. Foley remarked-that the Circumstances in this case seem largely out of your control. You mad every effort to accommodate it, you were given the wrong answers. None of the neighbors are complaining about it.

6 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes Motion carried.

Application 22-41 – Block 21.02 Lot 8 – R2 – 219 Virginia Ave – Krista and Chris Dilba – Applicants are seeking a USE variance to keep their duplex a duplex.

The board was a little confused about this application

Mrs. Richards stated that in 1978 it shows that is when it became a duplex. They governing body declared any properties that were duplexes 1964 and prior can stay a duplex. After 1965 it is considered an illegal duplex and not allowed.

Mr. Wells – when you bought it in 2015 it was advertised as a duplex

Mr. Dilba – yes. We have two electric services, two gas services, two water services.

Mr. Rotz – so the township assessed it as a duplex?

Mrs. Richards – yes.

Mrs. Discher – I don't see a side by side

Mr. Dilba – the entrance is on the left-hand side of the building.

Mrs. Discher – so there are currently people living upstairs other than yourselves?

Mr. Dilba – no one lives in that second. We have since moved out we are looking to just sell it.

Mr. Rotz – this is a use variance in order to move forward you are asking to convert a single-family home into a duplex.

Mr. Dilba – it has been bought and sold as a duplex for over 40 years.

Mr. Rotz – is there a way that we can give an interpretation

Mrs. Garty – what likely happened was in 1964 was the enactment of the township zoning ordinance and before that it was wild west and you build whatever you want. The township enacted a plan and within your zone it was never confirmed an existing duplex in 1964. They do have the ability to bring testimony to meet the burden of the positives outweighing the negatives. It has operated as a duplex, been taxed by the town that was since 1978. The negatives do not outweigh the positives. It enhances the property values, affordable housing, incomes to township to tax at higher rate.

Mr. Rotz – these individuals, to your knowledge was this property a duplex dating back prior to 1964. When you bought it, you were informed that the duplex condition was there for how long?

Mr. Dilba – it was advertised as a duplex, and no one really explained the amount of time it had been a duplex.

Page 13

A motion by Greg Wells to open to public portion, seconded by Jose Calves, all members present voted in the affirmative, Motion carried.

Colleen Cuneo – 218 Virginia Ave – Sworn In

Ms. Cuneo – we are across the street and have been out this house for a few years now. When the duplex is full of tenants there are typically 4-5 cars parked on the property. The zone is R2, they are not allowed to park in the front yard and they do. We are concerned moving forward that keeping it as a duplex will continue to affect the parking. Could there be a condition for adequate parking for the number of drivers in the house holds. For example, I lived in Collingswood where we had something in the back for parking.

Mr. Fusco – so they driveway in the photos does not belong to the home?

Mr. Dilba – no it does not. We have a gravel driveway the leads up to the house. The original driveway went to the back of the house, there is garage pad in the backyard where it was. When we bought the house, the owner had put a gravel driveway down a third of the house.

Mr. Rotz – as a condition of the approval you would agree to extend the driveway to the rear of the home.

Mr. Fusco – how many cars typically?

Mrs. Dilba – the people who are parking on the street get a parking pass so the township does accommodate the parking

Mr. Rotz – well the parking on the street is if you cannot park in your driveway

Mrs. Garty – the condition would be for the gravel driveway to allow for any specific number of spots there.

Mr. Fusco – requires to it go way back.

Mr. Palo – it would have to go into the backway and a big pad in the back

Mr. Fusco – maybe 54 ft.

Mr. Calves – so extend the gravel back to where the pad would be.

Mr. Rotz – yes, extend it back to the pad and we can approve it as a duplex.

A motion by Greg Wells to close public portion, seconded Jose Calves. All members presented voted in the Affirmative. Motion carried.

A motion by Jose Calves to approve the application with the condition that the gravel driveway be extended to the concrete pad to facilitate without exceeding the impervious coverage. Seconded by Greg Wells.

6 members voted yes, 0- no votes Motion carried.

Resolutions

Page 14

2022-30 – 25 E Cuthbert Blvd.

2022-36 – 82 Akron Ave

2022-37 – 272 Bewley

A motion by Marguerite Downham to approve all the resolution as presented, seconded by John Foley.

4 members voted yes, 0- no votes 2 Abstention. (Greg Wells & Jose Calves.)

Motion carried.

A motion by Greg Wells to go into Executive session, seconded by Marguerite Downham, all members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Executive session

A motion by Greg Wells to come out of executive session and return to public portion of the meeting, seconded Marguerite Downham. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Public meeting

Mr. Palo – Zoning Report

Burger King is going to come back and ask for existing reader board.

Mr. Fusco – if you have a question and the board has a question then let them come back and state their case.

Mr. Rotz – that is what they need to do. They do not have approval for a reader board. They need to come back and ask for a variance for the reader board.

CVS, Grease Money and Ace all potential for commercial

Mr. Fusco – I received information from Damian Del Duca for Guimarello – want to put windows

Mrs. Richards – they withdrew their application for that.

Mrs. Garty – it was beyond the scope of approval so they would have to come in.

With no further business tonight for the Haddon Township Planning/Zoning Board a motion by John Foley to adjourn, seconded by Greg Wells. All members voted in the affirmative.

Meeting adjourned 9:47 P.M.

A CD of this meeting is available upon request.

Respectfully submitted

Bonnie Richards, Secretary